

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Patent Application No. 10/775,633

Applicant: Kevin Burak

Filed: 02-10-2004

TC/AU: 2416

Examiner: LAI, ANDREW

Docket No.: 226432

Customer No.: 23460

APPELLANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Notice dated June 12, 2009, Appellants now submit a replacement section “Grounds of Rejection to be reviewed on Appeal.”

Respectfully submitted,



Phillip M. Pippenger, Reg. No. 46,055
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza
180 North Stetson Ave., Suite 4900
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: July 13, 2009

Grounds of Rejection to be reviewed on Appeal

This section was changed pursuant to a Notice of Noncompliant Brief, after discussion with a the Appeals intake specialist of record. Applicants were advised to change this section as reflected herein.

(1) Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Okada (US 2002/0018442).

(2) Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Okada (US 2002/0018442).

(3) Claims 3 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Okada (US 2002/0018442). Claims 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Okada in view of Kalkunte (US 20020010791). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Okada in view of Dreyer (US 6,098,103).

(4) Claims 11, 12, 14, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over a first embodiment of Okada in view of a second embodiment of Okada. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Okada in view of Dreyer (US 6,098,103). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Okada. Claims 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Okada in view of Kalkunte.